COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE COURTS

Telephonic Meeting Minutes November 8, 2011 Arizona State Courts Building Conference Room 119 A/B 1501 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:

Honorable Emmet Ronan, Chair
Honorable Keith D. Barth
Honorable Keith D. Barth
Ms. Dana Martinez

Ms. Joi Davenport Honorable Wendy Million

Honorable Lynn Fazz Ms. Lu Ann Garbini - proxy for Ms. Marla

Ms. Gloria Full Randall

Ms. V. Michele Gamez Ms. Kristine Reich Professor Zelda Harris Captain David Rhodes

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Elizabeth Ditlevson - proxy for Ms.

Ms. Leah Meyers, M.S.W.

Allison Bones

Chief Jerald L. Monahan

Ms. Pegg Derrow

Ms. Renae Tenney

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Honorable Carol Scott Berry Honorable Cathleen Brown Nichols

Ms. Cathy Clarich Ms. Andrea K. Sierra

Dr. Kathy S. Deasy
Detective Eugene J. Tokosh
Honorable Joseph P. Knoblock
Ms. Tracey J. Wilkinson

Patricia Madsen, Esq.

GUESTS / PRESENTERS:

Jamie A. Balson, Esq. Ms. Melinda Hardman

Ms. Theresa Barrett Ms. Amy Love

STAFF:

Ms. Kay Radwanski Ms. Tama Reily

I. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

With a quorum present, the November 8, 2011, meeting of the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts (CIDVC) was called to order by Judge Emmet J. Ronan, chair, at 10:05 a.m.

B. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the September 13, 2011, meeting of the CIDVC were presented for approval.

MOTION: To approve the September 13, 2011, meeting minutes as

presented. Motion seconded. Approved 17-0-1 CIDVC-

11-017

II. BUSINESS ITEMS/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

A. Public Access to Court Records Workgroup Report

Judge Ronan, chair, and Kay Radwanski, AOC committee staff, reported on the workgroup's recommendation for an ARPOP rule change. Consensus among workgroup members was that the Arizona Rules of Protective Order Procedure (ARPOP) be amended, rather than Rule 123, Rules of the Supreme Court. The rationale was that a person looking for information about protective order records would be more likely to look in ARPOP than in the Rules of the Supreme Court. The amended ARPOP rule would require that case files containing unserved protection orders remain closed until proof of service has been filed. Ms. Radwanski noted that the rule change recommendation was presented to the Committee on Superior Court and discussed informally at the October meeting of the Committee on Limited Jurisdiction Courts. It was supported by both groups.

MOTION: Judge Million moved that CIDVC file a rule petition on

civil orders of protection files with language to be determined at a later date. Motion seconded by Judge Hyatt. Approved unanimously. CIDVC-11-018

B. State Bar Proposals to Amend ARPOP Rules

Two ARPOP proposals from the Arizona State Bar were explained by Ms. Radwanski.

• Petition to amend ARPOP Rule 1(M)

Would require that when a court receives proof that a protective order has been served on a defendant, the court notify the plaintiff by mail.

• Petition to amend ARPOP Rule 6 (E)(4)(E)(2)

Would add the same "credible threat" language that is currently applied to Orders of Protection to Injunctions Against Harassment. That is that a judge may prohibit the defendant from possessing, purchasing, or receiving firearms for the duration of the order if the judge finds that the defendant poses a credible threat to the physical safety of the plaintiff or another person protected by the order.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the first proposal. Members had concerns as to whether the proposal fulfills its intended purpose, which is to further ensure the plaintiff's safety. Wisdom dictates that this would entail timeliness, but the proposed process does not appear to hasten notification.

MOTION: Judge Million moved to request additional information

prior to CIDVC making a formal recommendation. Motion seconded by Chief Monahan. Approved unanimously.

CIDVC-11-019

Upon review of the second proposal, Dana Martinez pointed out that there are domestic violence situations in which ex-partners enlist third parties to harass and intimidate their victims. Following discussion, members agreed that victims of harassment should receive the same protection as domestic violence victims.

MOTION: Judge Million moved to support the amendment to ARPOP

Rule 6(E)(4)(E)(2). Motion seconded by Ms. Martinez.

Approved unanimously. CIDVC-11-020

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Call to the Public

No comments offered.

B. Next Meeting

February 14, 2012 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Arizona State Courts Building Conference Room 119 A/B

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.